A LETTER,

IN WHICH

THE ARGVMENTS

OF THE ANNOTATOR,

And three other Speeches

Vpon their MAJESTIE's Letters

Publiſhed at LONDON, are

Examined and Anſwered.

The ſecond Edition.

OXFORD,

Printed by HENRY HALL Printer to

the VNIVERSITIE. 1645.

A LETTER,

IN WHICH

THE ARGVMENTS

OF THE ANNOTATOR,

And three other Speeches

Vpon their M[illegible]E'S Letters

Publiſhed at [illegible]ON, are

Examined and Answered.

The ſecond Edition.

OXFORD,

Printed by HENRY HALL Printer to

the UNIVERSITIE. 1645.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

SIR,

THAT I may continue our old freind ships I have for some yeares endeavoured to serve you, by imparting to you the Occurrences of this place, and particularly by transmitting such new bookes to your veiw, as might both serve to entertaine you, and to keepe you in a good opinion of the Parliament Cause which you and I so long since made choice of, yet I cannot deny but my thoughts checked at it when I sent you the late Arch-bishop's Diary. And though I may not keepe from you a new booke entituled, *The Kings Cabinet opened*, a discovery so much cried up by our party here, that though I would smother it I conceive it could not misse your hands. Yet seriously, Sir, I am not of the common opinion, and my hope is I shall not be held a Malignant for it. I conceive the Publication of these two bookes hath done much mischeife to our cause, though it were advised by the close Committee, for though discoveries of this nature have upon the Persons they concerne somewhat in them of a ridiculous infelicity, yet withall they have very much of advantage too, because they deepely worke into all wise men an exceeding strong beleife of those things which were let fall in so great secrecy. So that it should have beene well weighed before such Bookes had beene made publicke, whether, though they conteine some truths that make for our turne, they are not withall a full proofe of some others which

are down right destructive to us; for that Client sure hath weak Councell who produceth a witnesse, that in speaking for his cause, concludes more strongly for his Adversaries.

In the Arch-bishops papers there are I grant some things we did make good use of in *our declamations* to our many pretty wives, that did serve our turnes for a spurt to raise hoobubs, or get money: but Sadly Sir, is there any wise man you meet with (though he before perhaps parcht not his friend, or his enemy) who is not now throughly convinced, and by that same book we set out, that he was a man of a very publick composition, a man very much a Christian, exemplary in his devotions to God, in his loyalty to his Prince? And for that tax of his inclinations to Rome, which was almost proverbiall in our mouthes and stood us in so great steed, when we were to work on the People, I would gladly know, which way it was possible (*considering* the malignity of that vast popular *affection*) to have washt it quite out of all *Considering men heads*, but either by his Death, or his Diary: And was this a work fit for us? Nay I am more angry yet at our man of law, who would needs busie himself in that book, that he should not only want so much Logick, as to conclude him a Papist, out of those proofes, which indeed evince the quite contrary; but to speak plain, that he should want so much wit, as to hope to perswade others to have as little sence as himself.

And my great feare is, our publishing the Kings papers hath done us yet farre more mischief, in as much as it farre more concernes the advantage of our cause to keepe him in scorne with the people. Indeed the Arch-bishop is dead, and bites not, but if the King once returne into a good esteeme with our party, farewell our Armies we so much confide in, and ere long our feares and our jealousies. Read the booke, Sir, and tell me with that freedome that befits gentlemen and freinds, whether we have not long since both dranke of one common errour. To your I care not professe seriously, that I now hold the King a Prince of very choice endowments; and I judge him so by his letters, which wise men have oft told me give the best Characters of their Authors. I finde his stile masculine, his

his Counsells sharpe and rationall, his expressions full of a judicious fancy, he digests businesse throughly, and makes it all his owne. And for some of his Letters, they are of so elegant and so equall parts (for my breeding here and abroad makes me thinke I may judge a little) that in earnest I had rather have the abilities that might make me author of the fire, then to be Lord of that Manner that makes me neighbour to you; and yet you know it is a very faire one. And can you yet thinke it could be fit for us to expose these to publicke veiw? Beleeve it, Sir, he that writes thus deserves to governe, and my thoughts tell me, that this is the very man I should elect to a Throne were I to choose a King by Epistles. We oft you know tell the People that however in words and in practice the King makes Protestant shewes, yet that he is no lesse then a Papist in heart, and that when time shall serve he will be for *Rome* in profession. A course that hath beene to us of great use and gaine, and that which besides large summes hath brought us in store of rings and thimbles. And shall we now unluckily publish that selfe same letter too, wherein he tells the Queene that he differs from Her in nothing else but Religion? and then sure he is no Papist. If we shall say that he deserves no credit in this point, men of reason will soone make reply, that you may as well call all the rest in question. And then I pray what gaine have we made by this great Cabinet discovery? or why do we tell the People, *it were a great sinne against the mercies of God to conceale such evidences of truth?* But if for our owne sakes wee must now at least, grant this to be truth too, I pray consider, whether herein we have not published so high a proofe to those of our owne side, that King *Charles* is in heart a Protestant, as could neither have beene made by all his States-men, nor Divines, no nor by his owne Letters neither, had not wee our selves amongst braggs and raunts so vainely publisht them. For let the King or his servants or his Papers either, (had they been only made publicke by himselfe) have been brought to confirme this, the best arguments in the world, yet the faith of our Party is so much in our owne

hands, that they do not only beleeve all that we do, but indeed all that we would have them, so that if it concernes us they should beleeve that we know to be Lies, they are so kinde, they'l not refuse us. But when we our selves have once told the world, that the King is a Protestant, now should it concerne us in the highest degree to averre the contrary, so grosse an attempt would appeare nothing else but to be impudent to no purpose.

'Tis true, if this booke had never seene the light, you and I should have made no doubt at all of the King's Conjugall affection, yet I must confesse 'tis here set downe with so much vertue and eleganee, and hence appeares so be so handsome a thing, that for the time to come I shall love my owne wife the better. And though for the Queene I know not so much as her person, yet I cannot but conceive her a Lady of great parts, because I finde the King so seriously protest his great content in her conversation, for I am so much a Philosopher as to know, that must come from a similitude of minde. And what reason I have to judge highly of his, I told you now from his Letters so that I must needes wonder upon what ground our Annotator seemes so angry with the King that he makes use of her advises, especially since he is safe in point of Religion, and that we cannot deny. For among all sorts of men are Kings only bound their Wives shall be no helpers to them? And whatthough the Queene be of the weaker sex, must She therefore have no share in Counsells? Sure he that will thus argue against Queene *Maries* advise, makes Libells against Queene *Elizabeth*. Nor, are her abilities of the lesse use for being borne in *France*. For though a meere *Alien* may be suspected to incline too much to that Nation he was borne in, yet such suspicious vanish where greater reasons appeare; and sure none will deny me this, that to be a wife of *England* is a stronger tye, then to be a Daughter of *France*, especially when She is become the Mother of a Prince which She hopes may weare the English Crowne. And what our Annotator quotes in this kinde out of the King's Letters are me thinks very great impertinencies, Indeed he would seeme to Intimate, that the

Queene

Queen governs the King, & doth something in his affaires that
belongs neither Her, nor Him. But when I read what he quotes,
I am sorry that in this point we have no better arguments.
The King nor the Prince do take no servant without her. And
what then? Should I promise my wife that without her con-
sent I would admit of no servant at all, either about my selfe,
or my Children, I should extreamely wonder at the Logicke
of that man, that would conclude hence, I have given her the
breeches; nay, that would hence but inferre, that either I my-
selfe when I allow this freedome, or the wife I love, that
makes use of this allowance, do indeed the least thing that may
any way misbeseeme either. I finde that in case of the rec-
ception of *Onesimus* a servant (And I heard this observati-
on preach't by a Divine of our owne Assembly) Saint *Paul*
doth as well write to *Apphia*, as *Philemon*. It seemes they
were so well agreed, that their freinds tooke notice the Wife
had got a grain of a Vote too in things domestick. And yet
if this had argued that *Apphia* was not subject to her husband,
or that she made use of what became not a wife, I make no
doubt at all, but she had heard on't from that Apostle. But to
averre the *Queenes Councells are as powerfull as Commands*, be- Pag. 43.
cause the King professeth to preferre her health before his own
affaires, is but to argue a *Baculo in Angulo*, and so to make
the *Sophister* sport at *Oxford*. And indeed the next argu-
ment is not much better neither. *He avowes constancy to Her*
grounds and determinations, and how proves he this? Because the
King tells the Queene, *Thou shalt finde me constant to those* Letter 5.
grounds you left me withall. But doth it therefore fol-
low, that those grounds were Her inventions? or that thence
they must be called Her *determinations*, or Her *distastes*? It seemes
then, that because in your next journey hither, you shall be sure
to finde *London* on the banke of Thames, where you left
it. Therefore I may conclude they were your hands that set it
there. And so you are beholding to your old freind for making
you a new Founder of *London*.

Besides observe what those grounds are among the Letters,
pag. 6. you may read them, the same grounds he gave to his
Commissioners

Commissioners at *Uxbridge*, and this upon his word is according to the little note she so well remembers. what? Are these dangerous grounds; those wise, and reasonable instructions, this makes not well for us, so all can be inferred from hence is, the King acquainted the Queene upon what grounds he intended to seeke the Peace of this Kingdome? And therefore I well know not what he meanes by that quarrell, *That the Kings Councells are wholly mannaged by the Queene*; for to mannage a thing supposes it first is, before it be mannaged, so it seemes he thinks the King gives the Queene Counsell, and then she conceives it her part to see them executed. And what's here that befits not a wife, or if by mannaging he intend the Queene counsells the King, first the phrase is no more proper, then if I should say you therefore mannage my horse, because you gave him me. 2. It is not onely not unfit for a wife to present advise to her husband, but indeed extreamely proper, especially when she is not only of great abilities, but of as great affection to her husbands affaires; as many of his owne instances makes it cleare in his third Paragraph. But I must not hide it from you, Sir, That I find some good Cause to doubt that this Annotation prevaricates in our owne businesse, for though it appeares by the Kings Letters that to say the plaine truth, He dictates Counsells to the Queene And those full of use and sharpnesse; Yet what need he to have tunne into this kinde of observation? What need he to have told us, *That the King doth in many things surpasse the Queene? That he covers his acts of hostility with deeper and darker secrecy? That he urges her to make personall freindship with the Queen Regent?* (which indeed he doth, and that upon strong grounds of reason) *That he furnishes Her with dexterous policies & arguments to work upon the Ministers of State in France?* Are these notes fit to proceed from our Pens, who would have the People thinke that the Queene we talke downe is not onely the wife, but the very soule of the King? And yet doth he in many things surpasse the Queen? Are his reaches deeper and darker then hers? Can he go alone in these narrow pathes of State without the helpe of her hand? Nay can he lend a hand

to

to ſupport her the more ſafely in them. Can he himſelfe by his owne ſtrength ſo dextrouſly finde out what ſhall beſt make for his advantage? Beleive me, Sir, this Annotator is no freind of ours, he will perſwade our owne ſide that the King hath a cleare maſter wit. So that if we ſhould againe a ſecond time need to cry downe the King in point of his underſtanding, that Topicke is now gone, and we muſt lay the loſſe of ſo great an Engine not onely upon this that we would needs publiſh his Letters, but upon the ſcore of our further folly, that theſe forſooth muſt be ſet out with Annotations.

Put all this together, and you muſt perceive Sir the miſcheife this booke will do us. The People will hence ſee the choice Endowments of their King, and ſo be brought to love and honour him. They will deſcry the Proteſtant Religion in great Letters in his heart, which will yet adde more affection, to that love, and more reverence to that honour. 'Twill take off that uxorious ſlirre that hath beene ofturged to our advantage. And 'twill let the world ſee, that He is not only the Husband, but the King too of his Wife, and both relations ſo well tempered in him, That no mervaile if vulgar eyes dazle at the beames of ſuch a Sunne, and ſo ſometimes cannot ſee the King, becauſe he doth ſo well play the Husband.

But notwithſtanding this, Sir, That at the firſt ſight of this Booke, I much wiſhed it had not beene publiſhed, as being confident that theſe and the like paſſages will wrong more our cauſe, then all the reſt will advance it. Yet I muſt needs ſay, I had a ſtrange conceit that there were ſome clauſes in theſe publiſht Letters that might do the King hurt enough; I thought it a wicked thing to take off the Penall Lawes, and thereby to give a Toleration to the Papiſts, becauſe I have oft heard it from our beſt Divines, that their Religion is ſuperſtitious in the height, and in ſome ſence Idololatricall. But to bring in Forraigne Armes I held extreamely horrible, eſpecially the King having oft aſſured us He would doe neither of theſe two under ſtrong vowes and execrations.

But whil'ſt my thoughts remained fixed on theſe points, I here accidentally fell in with a freind of mine old Acquaintance,

tance, no professed Divine, but yet a Person of great Learning and Experience, and well studied in Divinity: A Malignant I confesse, but yet so honest and to me so open a man, That upon the word of a Gentleman, I would not for a world tell his name. When I had shewed him my thoughts, he joined with me in this, That the booke indeed made against us, but when I replied that in those particulars I named it had hurt the King too, he freindly smiled, and then talk't me downe, as I'le tell you.

First, he very gravely shewed, That it was unlawfull for sworne Subjects to take up armes against their King upon any pretence whatsoever. And that from *Rom.* 13. from the first of *Peter* 2. And that the ancient Church had both so understood and so practiced the doctrine of these two Apostles. That when Popes began to fall out with Kings the Divines of *Rome* were the first men that crossed that doctrine, and that when it made for their owne ends 'twas seconded by some who call themselves Reformed. And by the Calvinists more particularly.

But when I rejoined, that those Texts had no such sense, and that they came not home unto that holy Cause we are set for. He gently let me see, that the replies I used were indeed plaine subterfuges, and made me clearely understand and gave me instances too, That a witty Adulterer might as well defend there was no Sinne in Fornication. I still talk't on with much heate and noise, So that to this day he knowes not at all he wrought any change in my thoughts, but yet I must needs tell you this in your eare, that that night I sleept not so soundly.

The next day we met againe, and I fumingly asked him with what colour men could justify the Conscience of the King, In his taking off those Penall Lawes, giving Toleration to Papists; And that against the ties of those Solemne Vowes he hath expressely made to his People? He told me he much wondred, that Subjects who were resolved to use no Conscience at all should trouble the King so with his, but yet for my satisfaction he willed me to weigh it well:

That it was One thing to consider sinne in it selfe, Another

to consider it in it's punishment. Against sinne it selfe God made the Law Morall. And it's therefore a Law of unfading obligation. But what was decreed for the punishment of sinne, you shall finde that in his Judicialls, which were alterable (some thinke in *Jury* it selfe, but without doubt in all other nations. Should the King passe a Law Popery were no sinne, nay should he suffer no such Law as doth declare it sinnefull, I might then thinke him sinfull too. But when we come to the Judicialls once, to the punishment of this sinne, we are then no doubt in a farre greater Latitude. And wise men have still thought, that such both well may and must be tempered sometimes to the Exigences of that State we live in. So Divines thinke that in Case of Theft *Solomon* in those words did alter Gods Judiciall Law. *If* (sayes he) *the theife be found he shall pay seaven fold, Prov. 6.* When yet *Moses* we know required but foure for that sinne. And the reason of this change is conceived to be this, because the crime of theft grew more frequent with the Iewes in the time of *Solomon*.

And for that Cause Christian States set it higher yet, and nothing now is more frequent then to punish a Theife either with a wheele or the Gallowes. By this instance you see Judiciall Lawes might be heightned; By the next you'l finde that it was commonly beleeved by most sorts of men that they might be abated too. For Adultery in the Mosaick Law was punish't by death. A Judiciall that for some hundreds of yeares was continued in the Law Civill, and remained there, without repeale even after the Empire was growne Christian. Yet *Justinian* after he had written his Institutions and his Code, began to lessen it in one sexe; And in succeeding times there were few Kingdomes or States that abated not of this rigour. So that what was of old punisht with the sword or the Gibbet, is now brought into a white Sheet, and that by some Lawes may be commuted againe into Almes.

And here he told me he could not choose but smile at the zeale we seemed to carry against the abbrogation of Penall Lawes, since a Statute of this Parliament (at least as we interpret it) hath taken off all meanes to punish any sinnes of the

flesh. Popery you like well should continue punish't, but Adultery shall goe bare fac't; and yet this foule sin is expresly against the words of the Scripture, The other only by an inference. Truly Sir, said he, I neither am nor can be a Papist, nay as a private man I hold my self bound to doe the best I can That that superstition spread no farther, but yet by your leave I hold him no better then an Hypocrite who shewes great warmth of zeale that he may punish a Papist, and yet likes it extreme well That all Lawes are laid a sleep which should curb Adulterers.

Now then said he, view the words of the Letter you doe so much quarrell at: The King writes to the Queen—*I give thee power to propose in my name That I will take away all the penall Lawes against the Roman Catholicks in England, as soon as God shall enable me to doe it—So as by their meanes, or in their favours I may have so powerfull assistance as may deserve so great a favor and inable me to doe it*—He promiseth to take away all the penall Lawes, All the Lawes which are now in being, which to some men are Capitall, to other pecuniary, and that in a sharp heavy manner; He promiseth not, that he will make none of a lower kind, He promiseth not his Lawes shall look with the like serene face upon the Popish side, as the Protestant. Let him but hold here, and no learned man will say he sinnes, especially in this great necessity of State; Though indeed, said he, I should extreamly grieve to see things in this sad condition. And he spake it confidently, so would the King too, And therefore he beshrew'd us (for he durst be bold with me) that we had brought a good Prince into the jawes of these sad extremities. But yet, sayes he, let him goe no farther, and he who shall call this a Toleration of Papists, may as well taxe the more famous part of almost the whole Christian World for a Toleration of Adultery.

Indeed two of your three Orators, whom you set up to oppose the King (and the opposition was most proper, for his Letters are remarkeable both for reason and elegance, and their Declamations have neither) would needs collect out of this Clause, *That the King's meaning was to abrogate these Penall Lawes*

Lawes by Force. Grant it were ſo, are they ſo angry at that? I have read of ſome men *Qui aliorum vitijs irascuntur quasi invideant*, who are paſſionate indeed at the vices of others, but that paſſion of theirs is not a hate, but an envy that any man ſhould make uſe of ſuch glorious ſinnes but themſelves; for is't not your whole work to pull down Lawes by force? To pull the Sword out of the Kings hand, and Church Government from the Biſhops, both which our Lawes yet eſtabliſh? Is not the *Common Prayer* book confirmed by plain Lawes? and is't not by force that you teare it? The King, it ſeemes, muſt keep himſelf to Lawes, becauſe that ſplendid dignity of breaking Lawes by force is the Priviledge of both Houſes.

But in earneſt, becauſe the King ſaies *So ſoone as God ſhall inable him, And if he may be furniſhed from abroad with ſuch a powerfull aſſiſtance as to be able to doe it*: Can you neceſſarily conclude he meant to alter theſe Penall Lawes by meere force? Did the King tell you he meant ſo? If not, by your favour, this is to add to, and to make Conjectures upon the King's words, not to draw good Collections from them; And no man will be bound to receive ſuch inferences, except thoſe alone who conceive becauſe your three Orators have neither Rhetorick nor Logick, therfore without doubt they are extreme good at Divination. Truly Sir, ſaid he, I have reaſon to think, and that from the ſence of ſome men who have the honour to hear the King diſcourſe frequently, his meaning was but this, That if God ſhould enable him, by ſuch forraigne power, that he might againe ſit in a free and full Parliament, He would endeavor, as much as in him lay, to take off thoſe penall Lawes; And in that Caſe he made no doubt at all, but to gaine the votes of his people, becauſe in this great extremity they had been ſo much beholding to his forraigne help; For in this conjuncture of things, what in plaine gratitude they were bound to doe, I leave honeſt men to conſider. But that Lawes once eſtabliſh't by the King and both Houſes ſhould be annulled by meer force, or by any meanes but by the ſame they were made, is a thing I aſſure my ſelfe the King hates more perfectly, then any man who is in the higheſt Vogue now at Weſtminſter.

To that quere then of your Annotatour, how this Letter can ſtand with the King's frequent profeſſions of no Toleration of Papiſts, No abolition of thoſe Penall Lawes, and the like? The anſwere is now moſt apparent; for to whom but to his people were theſe profeſſions made? and if his intentions be not to alter what he then profeſſed but by the conſent of his people, all this is moſt juſt and Kingly; for no man is bound to keep his promiſe to that man who is now willing to releaſe him. If he be, the King can alter no Lawes, no not by conſent of both Houſes themſelves, becauſe he hath been once ſworn to keep them. Nay ſince the King hath as deeply vowed to defend the true Proteſtant profeſſion (that is, as 'tis now eſtabliſhed by Law) if he find no meanes now to keep this vow, but by the help of forrainers, and that he may gain their help by letting goe thoſe penall Lawes, I rather hold he is in Conſcience bound to make uſe of that help; and what inconvenience ſo ever ſhall fall out upon that uſage, muſt needs be put upon the ſcore of thoſe men who have forced him to thoſe great neceſſities.

But your Annotatour tells us, That the King by his profeſſions is as deeply bound not to make uſe of forraigne forces, And I remember, ſaid he, that you but now held the introduction of ſuch forces tobe extreamly horrible; and indeed it might well ſeem ſo, had not you firſt begun the courſe; but then *vim vi repellere*, to deale with wicked men as they firſt deale with us, doth in caſe of neceſſity free us from all guilt of wickednes; For good Sir, ſaid he, are not the Scots forrainers? They ſhould indeed be under the ſame King with us, but they have neither the ſame Lawes, nor at this day the ſame Religion, as the word Religion is now vulgarly uſed; for, flatter not your ſelves, wiſe and learned men know the difference is extreamly wide betweene a *Knoxian*-taught man, and an Engliſh *Proteſtant*.

But the King hath obliged himſelf by his word, That he will make no uſe of ſuch forces. True indeed, he told you ſo *March* 9. 1641. and againe *March* 26. 1642. But when in 1643. you traiterouſly brought in the Scots, with what face

can

can you affirm, That he is now bound by those engagements? When men expect others should keepe promise with them, they must be carefull so to keep it themselves; that by their own fault at least they doe not wilfully change, and persist in changing that condition of their estate which drew men to make those promises; for then such ties will become no obligations. You may have an instance in God himselfe, in that solemn promise which he made unto the house of *Ely*, *I said indeed, that thy House and the House of thy Father should walk before me for ever, but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me, for them that honor me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.* 1 *Sam.* 2. He had sworn the Priesthood unto *Ely*'s House, because they were yet carefull that his Sacrifices were well kept, and his Service honourable; But when, wilfully, his sonnes brought the people to abhorre the Offerings of the Lord, then straight it followes. *Be it farre from me* for my promise made unto the sonnes of *Aaron*, bindes me not to the sonnes of *Belial*. Apply but this ground, (which is as cleare as the Text can make it) and your Annotatour may with ease resolve all his queries. The King promised us he would make no use of forraigne forces; True, if good Subjects, as you should be, were not turned to Traitours, But then if ye will needs invite in the Scots, you teach him to doe the like, eyther by the French or the Lorrainers. The King oft complaines of the Irish Rebels, exhorts the Houses that they would unite to chastise them, yet now he makes Peace with the selfe same men. And how is this reconcileable? Easily, for if those Houses instead of fighting with their King had made warre upon those Rebels, great good had come upon those complaints, and that union. But when they turn'd Rebels and oppoled their Soveraigne, he was constrained to make Peace with his Irish Papists, that he might save the throats of his Protestants. The King professed, he had no intent of war with his Parliament (so these still call themselves) and then how can this be reconciled that he is now in Armes against them? Thus, Because these have changed their condition; of Subjects they have turned themselves into Rebels, and going about to pull down both the Church and

State,

State, the King according to His Oath muſt needes take up armes to defend them. But in this particular a paſſage cited out from one of the King's Declarations by Maſter *Browne* your Oratour might have fully ſatisfied your Annotator. The words are—*We will maintaine and obſerve the Acts aſſented to by Us this Parliament without violation; and that we have not, nor ſhall not have any thought of uſing any force, unleſſe we ſhall be driven to it for the ſecurity of Our Perſon, and for the defence of the Religion, Lawes and Liberties of the Kingdome, and the juſt Rights & Priviledges of Parliament.* A Limitation then there is put to this promiſe. He will uſe no force, unleſſe he be firſt driven to it; but in that Caſe (and that's the caſe we are in) no ingenious man can reproach the King with a violation of his promiſe. So that you ſee, it's ſtill a Truth the King tels the Queene in the 11 of his publiſh't Letters, *That by equivocating to hide the breach of his word is that he hates above all things.* A Speech truly royall, and that muſt needs gaine eſteeme from your ſelves unto that ſoule that let it fall. For upon your owne grounds you can but ſay, you believe it leſt your owne tongue ſhould confeſſe, That's no diſcovery of truth which you lately found in the Cabinet.

I ſhall ſpend (ſaid He) no more time in this, onely I muſt let you know, that it ſeemes probable to me that your Annotatour feared the ſtrength of this plaine reply; And therefore takes great paines to perſwade us to beleeve, that they are ſtill the ſame men they were; and that the King hath no cauſe to looke upon them now otherwiſe then he did, when on the ſecond of *June* 1642, they preſented Him with the 19. Propoſitions. If this be true he ſaies ſomething, but how doth he prove it? Becauſe the Propoſitions of the Parliament lately treated at *Uxbridge, Feb.* 1644. were no other in effect then the 19 Propoſitions ſent to the Northin *June* 1642. A pretty argument; you ſpeake to this day the ſame language you did; Therefore your Actions make your perſons no worſe then when you did but onely ſpeake. The Articles at *Uxbridge* are the ſame with the 19 Propoſitions. Therefore to bid battell and to ſhoot at the perſon of your King at *Edge-hill*, and other fields,

fields. Therefore to invite Foraigners; the *Scots* to invade *England*, makes you no worse, but leaves your Cause the same that it was before the warre began. Sir, said he to me, upon the word of a Gentleman, doe you thinke this to be reason? Might not *Hoshai* and *Phinees* much better have replied to their God. That they spake still as they were wont, with their tongues, they still called him Lord, and that's more then you doe, to give good language to your King. And therefore he ought to have kept his Promise to their House, although indeed in some actions of theirs, they had since that promise abused his Sacrifices, and runne themselves into some pretty faults, as defiling the women at the very doore of the Tabernacle. But it's a true observation, Corruption of life breeds a blindnesse of understanding. And I shall not mervaile at all to see a man loose his sence, when I finde he hath once lost his Loyalty.

But in another place your Annotour will needs furnish us with three motives more to induce us to beleive, that the cause is now the same it was when the King first tooke up armes, and as it was when the King made most of these Oathes and Protestations: That their cause is not altered: That they are noe worse Rebels then they were. Where first, said he, I must tell you, that there is a great difference betweene their demands, and their Cause; Their demands indeed are the same they were, or at the least they have received no remarkeable alteration. But he who is at first but saucy in his demands may prosecute what he seekes by such damnable meanes, that it may make his present Cause much worse then his first demands. In their demands indeed they were insolent, but yet while they did but demand in a Parliamentary way let them for this once passe with that Tax alone; But when they tooke up Armes to constreine the King to yeild to their demands, this makes their cause plaine Rebellion. And when againe they called in the *Scots* that they might adde more strength to their decaying armies. This (talke they what they will) makes them yet appeare in the sight of all good men more vile and more horrid Rebels. 'Tis a mistake then, that their cause is not altered.

And when the Annotator talks but of moſt of the Kings Oaths and Proteſtations, he himſelfe in ſeemes frees him from the breach of ſome. And for the reſt I conceive Sir, ſaid he, I have given you ſatisfaction.

But will you have thoſe three motives too, whereby the Annotatour will induce you to beleeve, that they are no worſe Rebels then they were. Theſe are his owne words. *None can affirme otherwiſe who takes notice firſt of our late ſufferings, ſecondly of our ſtrange patience even now after the diſcovery of theſe papers, and thirdly after our extraordinary ſucceſſe in the feild.* Inducements if they be any, they ſeeme very inconſiſtent. For doe both their ſufferings and their proſperity too argue them to be no worſe Rebels? 'Tis much that both thoſe *Topicks* ſhould be at once at their ſervice, but weigh them all apart you will find they make piteous arguments. Firſt, They have lately ſuffered, therefore they are no worſe Rebels. Secondly, they have had ſtrange patience after the diſcovery of theſe papers, after their victory at *Naſeby* (and that's a virtue indeed to be patient in proſperity) therefore they are no worſe Rebels. Thirdly, they had lately in the feild extraordinary ſucceſſes, therefore they are no worſe Rebels. They ſhould do well to vote, that theſe reaſon doe conclude, and ſo make them good by an Ordinance, elſe there's little hope they will e're downe with their owne Admirers. For the two firſt doe ſcarce colour for reaſon, and the third, ſure the Annotatour tooke out of *Bellarmine*, who makes temporall felicity to be a note of the true Church, and ſo concludes the Proteſtants have no ſoundneſſe in their Religion, becauſe ſome time they had not victory in the feild, and ſo you plainely ſee the third reaſon is Popery. I ſuppoſe Sir, (ſaid he) you have now altered your minde, and clearely perceive thoſe two particulars you named can with reaſonable men doe the King no hurt at all. And though there be little elſe either in your Annotatour or your Oratours which the worſt men can make much uſe of, yet you ſhall have what I conceive upon ſome few of their more materiall paſſages.

And firſt your Annotatour is not ingenuous, to ſay no worſe,

to

to charge the King with ſtirring rumours about his mothers chaſtity. No, they who examined witneſſes and conferred circumſtances and times, to finde a knot in that tumult, they ſtirred rumours indeed, and thoſe unchriſtianly numerous. But for the King privately to complaine of that horrid wrong unto his uncle of *Denmarke*, that he might thereby the more ſtrongly incite him to his aſſiſtance was (as much as in him lay,) to revenge rumours ſtirred. And for you thus to publiſh what he privately wrote, is a ſecond time to give the world notice of what you impiouſly ſtirred at firſt. And then your Annotatour, to make this wickednesse full, lays your owne fault upon your King. Pag. 42.

He is angry at this. The King calls us a Parliament publickly (in his Commiſſions about the Treaty) yet acknowledges us not a Parliament ſecretly. And what then? The old Role was *Verba aulica non obligant*, Ceremonies are no obligations. And are there no complements to be uſed in Treaties. If I call a Clowne whom I know ſo, by the name of Maſter, may I not yet privately ſay, and ſtand to it too, that he is no Gentleman? Muſt I therefore be needs falſe, becauſe I am Civill? Truly Sir, ſaid he, were you your ſelfe to treat with a ſtrong theife, I ſhould not dare to ſay you were therefore a falſe man, becauſe ſometimes in hope to obtaine your owne you called him an honeſt gentleman. But the Kings words are—*If there had been but two beſides my ſelfe of my owne opinion, I had not done it*—very likely: for no man is bound to be Ceremonious. And the *Macedonians* were not a whit the worſe men, becauſe in plaine tearmes they uſed to call a ſpade a ſpade. The words of his Letter run—*The argument that prevailed with moſt, that the calling did no waies acknowledge them* (in law I ſuppoſe he meant) *to be a Parliament*, upon which *Condition* and *Conſtruction* I did it, and no otherwiſe, and accordingly it is regiſtred in the Counſell bookes with the Counſells unanimous approbation. For Sir (ſaid he) If in civility I call my ſelfe your ſervant, It doth not follow that in law I am ſo. And if I ſtraight privately tell another, I will not doe your commands, I cannot yet conceive that you would have cauſe to accuſe me of falſhood. Pag. 45.

But the King ſeekes Treaties and winnes upon the People by that ſhew, and yet chooſeth ſuch Commiſſioners and binds them up with ſuch Inſtructions, that all Accommodation is impoſſible. *Mutato nomine de te fabula*, That your Commiſſioners were thus tyed up all the world knowes. And at *Uxbridge* in open conference they did not ſticke to acknowledge it. But though the King cauſed thoſe directions you have publiſht to be read to his Commiſſioners, yet he openly declared (as they all well know) that he meant them not in the formality of Inſtructions, he meant not they ſhould be obligatory to them, but he left them free to themſelves, onely he told them that by theſe directions he had acquainted them with his ſence, and left them to doe that which became men of Honour and his Commiſſioners. This I had Sir, ſaid he, from a Perſon I dare truſt, and I beleive it had beene better, when this ſhall come to be knowne, if your Annotatour had held his peace.

Pag. 46.

And is not that a pretty Collection made by your firſt Oratour, Who becauſe the King ſaies he will never quit *Epiſcopacy* nor the *Sword*, concludes there was at the Treaty no hope of a happy and well-grounded Peace. And why? becauſe the ſword is in the Kings hand, is he therefore ſtill bound to draw it? Or hath no man a juſt right that he may weare a ſword but that he's ſtraightway tyed to be fighting? When Saint *Paul* affirmes, *that Princes beare not the ſword in vaine*, noe doubt he meanes the Sword as well of Peace, as of Warre. Nay the onely way to ſee peace, is to ſee that the ſword is in the Scabbard, Is to ſee it in the Kings hand. But where Subjects begin to wreſt away that weapon from him. This Oratours argument is undoubtedly good, Where there is ſuch a Sword there is fighting.

Pag. 5.

Your ſecond Oratour is not much more candid neither: In his City *Rhetoricke* he would caſt hatred on the King, becauſe he would graunt an alteration of penall Lawes to the *Iriſh Popiſh Rebels*, but no alterance of Lawes for the ſettlement of the Proteſtant Religion, though they be deſired from a Proteſtant King. If, ſaid he, It were proved, that becauſe King CHARLES

Pag. 8.

is a Protestant Prince, therefore he is bound to like of a Protestant Rebellion; This discourse might have some reason in it. But if crimes are the more foule, when they are done by Protestants, something may be said in favour of a Popish Rebell, especially when he askes the penall Lawes alone, and the other at once gapes both at the Mitre, and the Crowne. When he will neither endure the sword in the Kings hand, nor excommunication in the Bishops, nor that God should be served by our Liturgy. And yet declaimes at a Common Hall, this this forsooth is for the advancement of the Protestant Religion; which I wonder. Not that I am sure which is established by law, and that which we were all borne and bred in. And that which no more then five yeares since we all called Protestant in *England*. And for the settlement and advancement whereof the King denies to doe nothing. No 'tis plaine the man meanes the Religion of *John Knox*, which first wrested the sword out of Queene MARY of *Scotlands* hand, and is now doing the like to her Grandson. So that hereupon I desire this Oratour would turne Judge, and gravely determine which he thinkes better for the King: Whether he shall yeild his penall Lawes alone unto his *Irish* Rebells, who then fighting for his Crowne, fight by consequence for his Religion too, though indeed they themselves are Papists; or whether he shall yeild both Church and Crowne too unto his English Rebels, and so suffer them to alter his Religion it selfe, onely upon this ground, because they call themselves Protestants?

You third Oratour besides other his weake inferences, would hence conclude a breach of word in the King, because he promised to *keepe all the Acts of this Parliament inviolable*, and yet had any two but joined with him he would not have called them a Parliament: and there he cries, *How can these stand together?* Very well; except all mankinde were bound to have as little Logicke, as himselfe. For a contradiction must be *Secundum idem*, and *eodem tempore*. They were a Parliament when the King gave consent to their acts, and 'tis therefore he intends to keepe them, but having now runne into so foule a rebellion 'tis at his pleasure what to speake in this case; and Pag. 17.

and he may now say, they are no Parliament: But he goes on. *The King hath told us he will maintaine the Lawes and observe them himselfe. And yet he layes the blood-guiltinesse of those warres upon the innocent blood* (as he calls it) *of my Lord of Strafford*, who was condemned by himselfe, and by the Law. That, he saies, he will maintaine. For that personall Law made against the life of the Lord of *Strafford*, the King did maintaine, and observe it, for within a few daies he signed a warrant for his death. So that this law is now at an end, and by the words of the same Law it must not be drawne to example; and yet is he still bound to maintaine that Law now expired? Or may not the King be sorry for what he then did amisse, but his repentance is a breach of law? I had thought that a Prince then maintaines and observes his Lawes when he sees them put in execution. But that he is so strictly tied that he may not speake against the sence of any one of his Lawes, or wish it had not beene enacted, is more, I confesse, then is beleived by me, or as I conceive by this Orator. Truly Sir, said he, when I did read the Letter, into which the King put that passage, I could scarce refraine teares of joy to find him so sensible of the crime he conceived he had done by communicating in that bloody sinne; not doubting, but that God, who had given him this true Sence of his fault, had brought him to as true Repentance. And though I hold the Arch-Bishops Death (which the King speakes of in the same Letter, and your Annotatour takes so much notice of) in the Construction of all Law a most compleate perfect murther, and make no more doubt that God will revenge it, then I do that he is in Heaven; Yet I dare prescribe no set time unto divine Justice. I neither know when God will command a blessing upon the Repentance of the King, or a curse upon the foule murther of the Parliament. Nor indeed doth the King prescribe it, He onely writes,—*I beleive it is no Presumption hereafter to hope that his hand of Justice must be heavier upon them*—He saies not it must hereafter be heavier, nor so much as That he hopes it will be so. Onely he beleives it no presumption to hope. A speech let fall with so much Christian wariness, that I could heartily wish we Subjects had learned to speake with

like the caution of our King, as he hath done to speake of God.

And now Sir, said he, I must from my soule tell you how passionately I am greived to see sworne Subjects thus labouring to abuse their Kings; nay to see them thus abuse themselves, that they may the more abuse him; and to see all this done in *England*. Beleive it, 'tis no presumption to thinke that the crime of *Cham* will at length meet with *Cham*'s reward. But when men strive to outdoe *Cham*, to say their Father's drunke, when he is not, and then jeere him downe as if he were now drowned in wine, what Curse may they expect when his was made thus great, *A Servant of Servants shall he be*. And though this Prophesy was not straightway fulfilled, yet 'twas not therefore the lesse true, or fearefull. Indeed what the wise man observed may hold as well in these times of ours, because God proceeds not suddainly to judgement, *Therefore the Hearts of the Sonnes of men are wholly set in them to doe Evill*. And this will as well hold in ours and all times, that where men doe still sinne with a high proud hand, there will at length follow judgment. Take heed, Sir, said he, lest from your present prosperity you begin with that *Cardinall*, straightway to inferre the goodnesse of your Cause. No, The *Benjamites* thrived twice at that same time when they were most injurious, and yet ere long they fell, and were beholding to their care whom they wickedly opposed, that of a Tribe they were not brought to nothing. Our Actions must be judged not by successe, but by Lawes. And I shall then thinke your party will escape those Judgements which I feare, when there is either no such Text, *Thou shalt not speake evill of the Ruler of thy People*; Or that I thinke him, whom we have sworne to be our *Onely* Supreame Governour, to have no share among those Rulers. When I shall be brought to hold Repentance may be sinne in a King, And that murther is none, so it be done by a Parliament: When by the distinctions of your Divines I can perswade my selfe, that this Rebellion is no Crime, Or when they can make me beleive, that either those two Apostles did not understand Christ, or the Ancient Church those Apostles.

Here my old freind pretended businesse and left me. And truly

truly, Sir, I must confesse to you that he left me in a great perplexity; for I know him a most honest man, and I find it to be true, that reason then gaines extreamely in the weight, when it hath once passed through such a furnace. I assure you he hath much troubled me, I would not say converted me, but I cannot divine how my Conscience will hold out, for this appeares to me so much reason that if you have not somewhat to satisfy me with, Beleive me, I am much afraid how long I shall continue a freind to our present Cause, though I shall never leave off to be,

Sir,

Your very faithfull Servant.

FINIS.